UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/684,163	10/10/2003	Rostislav Shabalin	MS1-2672US	2292

22801 7590 10/31/2007
LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, LOAN	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2114	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/684,163	SHABALIN, ROSTISLAV
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LOAN TRUONG	2114

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 August 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-26* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7 and 9-26* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to applicant's arguments filed on August 6, 2007.

2. Claims 1-7 and 9-26 are presented for examination, claims 1, 6, 9, 12, 16 and 20 are amended and claim 8 is cancelled.

3. Claim objection for claim 6 and U.S.C 101 rejection for claims 9-11 has been withdrawn based on the amendment.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed August 6, 2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In regard to claim 1, applicant stated that Sullivan does not disclose or suggest the application error being reported in an error message box and report an application error with an URL that enables a user to contact product support. Also, applicant mention that Sullivan only displayed an error message and not generate the error message box as recited in claim 1. Examiner disagrees with this interpretation. Since the error message box is displayed to the user who has tried unsuccessfully to launch an application (*col. 7 lines 45-50)*, it is inherent that this error message is generated before it can be display and therefore satisfied the generation of an error message. Furthermore, the display of this error message prompted the user to request technical support (*col. 7 lines 45-50)* where a client machine may include a Web browser which is a know software tool used to access the servers of the network and the network path to a server is identified by a Uniform Resource Locator (URL) (*col. 5 lines 9-15)*. Finally, applicant raised the issue that column 8 lines 52-67 of Sullivan describes self-help information is not part of an error reporting process as a result of an application failure. It is not relevant whether this self-help process is or not part of an error reporting process since no where in applicant's claim mention that this self-help process cannot be part of an error processing or the fact that while applicant does not use this process would exclude others from implementing it in an error reporting process.

Claim 20 recited similar limitation as claim 1 and therefore examiner maintains the rejection.

In regard to claim 9, 12 and 16 applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 20-23 and 25-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sullivan et al. (US 6,615,240).

In regard to claim 1, Sullivan et al. disclosed a method for reporting errors in an application, the method comprising:

generating an error message box upon determination that an error occurred (*self help technique generate an error message when user has tried unsuccessfully to launch an application, col. 7 lines 44-50)*, the generation of the error message box by way of an error handling mechanism engaged upon determination that the error occurred (*the display of this error message has prompted the user to request technical support through the Motive Assistant for error handling, col. 7 lines 44-67)*;

displaying the error message box (*display the error message when user has tried unsuccessfully to launch an application, col. 7 lines 44-50)*;

connecting to product support (*HTTP request is made to the automated technical support server, col. 8 lines 30-32)* in response to selection of a universal resource locator (URL) in the error message box (*self help facilitated through use of active content pages with a given diagnostic map associated with a page via a URL, col. 8 lines 52-67)*; and

passing a string to product support (*the search string is a value when fed into the technical support server produce relevant hits for solving the technical problem, col. 9 lines 25-29)*, the string including an error message identifier corresponding to information concerning the error (*problem area and description are entered by the user to be submitted through a new service request, col. 8 lines 1-8).*

In regard to claim 2, Sullivan et al. disclosed the method of claim 1 wherein the errors are automatically resolved to corresponding documentation (*step 62 determine whether the user requires automated technical support and if user indicated request for technical support the routine continues to step 64 to bring up an interface including a listbox of possible problem* *areas, col. 7 lines 51-67).*

In regard to claim 3, Sullivan et al. disclosed the method of claim 1 further comprising: matching the error message identifier to information concerning the error (*user selects a problem area and provide problem area and description, col. 7 lines 61-67 and col. 8 lines 1-7).*

In regard to claim 4, Sullivan et al. disclosed the method of claim 1 further comprising: receiving information from product support in response to the passing of the string (*client GUI provide dialog boxes to enable the user to monitor the interaction during a connection with an SE when live help is required, col. 7 lines 25-28).*

In regard to claim 6, Sullivan et al. disclosed the method of claim 1 wherein the error message box is a graphical user interface including a link to URL that can be activated by a user to connect to product support (*action content pages is a web based content that has one or more diagnostic maps associated with a page via a URL, col. 8 lines 52-64).*

In regard to claim 7, Sullivan et al. disclosed the method of claim 6 wherein the graphical user interface further includes a title, the link and a button for the user to acknowledge the error (*error message included for example "wwintl32.dll error" and prompted the user to request technical support, col. 7 lines 44-50).*

In regard to claim 20, Sullivan et al. disclosed a computer storage medium having stored therein instructions for performing acts for creating an error message, the acts comprising:

generating an error message box upon determination that an error occurred (*self help technique generate an error. message when user has tried unsuccessfully to launch an application, col. 7 lines 44-50)*, the generation of the error message box by way of an error handling mechanism engaged upon determination that the error occurred (*the display of this error message has prompted the user to request technical support through the Motive Assistant for error handling, col. 7 lines 44-67*);

displaying the error message box (*display the error message when user has tried unsuccessfully to launch an application, col. 7 lines 44-50)*;

connecting to product support (*HTTP request is made to the automated technical support server, col. 8 lines 30-32)* in response to selection of a universal resource locator (URL) in the error message box (*self help facilitated through use of active content pages with a given diagnostic map associated with a page via a URL, col. 8 lines 52-67)*; and

passing a string to product support (*the search string is a value when fed into the technical support server produce relevant hits for solving the technical problem, col. 9 lines 25-29)*, the string including an error message identifier corresponding to information concerning the error (*problem area and description are entered by the user to be submitted through a new service request, col. 8 lines 1-8).*

In regard to claim 21, Sullivan et al. disclosed the computer storage medium of claim 20 wherein the errors are automatically resolved to corresponding documentation (*step 62 determine* *whether the user requires automated technical support and if user indicated request for technical support the routine continues to step 64 to bring up an interface including a listbox of possible problem areas, col. 7 lines 51-67).*

In regard to claim 22, Sullivan et al. disclosed the computer storage medium of claim 20, the acts further comprising: matching the error message identifier to information concerning the error (*user selects a problem area and provide problem area and description, col. 7 lines 61-67 and col. 8 lines 1-7).*

In regard to claim 23, Sullivan et al. disclosed the computer storage medium of claim 20, the acts further comprising: receiving information from product support in response to the passing of the string (*client GUI provide dialog boxes to enable the user to monitor the interaction during a connection with an SE when live help is required, col. 7 lines 25-28).*

In regard to claim 25, Sullivan et al. disclosed the computer storage medium of claim 20, wherein the error message box is a graphical user interface including a link to URL that can be chosen by the user (*action content pages is a web based content that has one or more diagnostic maps associated with a page via a URL, col. 8 lines 52-64).*

In regard to claim 26, Sullivan et al. disclosed the computer storage medium of claim 25 wherein the graphical user interface further includes a title, the link and a button for the user to acknowledge the error (*error message included for example "wwintl32.dll error" and prompted the user to request technical support, col. 7 lines 44-50)*.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

6. Claims 5 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. (US 6,615,240) in further view of Bradfield et al. (US 2003/0185368).

In regard to claim 5, Sullivan et al. teach the method of claim 1 wherein the string includes one or more of a vendor name (*Microsoft office site, fig. 12)*, a product name (*Wwint, fig. 12)*, an image of the application state (*diagnostic state of the computer into the support center, col. 12 lines 39-50)*, the error message identifier (*having problem with Word, fig. 12)*, and the string enabling interaction between a user and product support via an application programming interface (*request for live help, fig. 4, 74, col. 12 lines 9-50).*

Sullivan et al. does not teach the method of claim 1 wherein the string includes a language appropriate for the application.

Bradfield et al. disclosed the method of the packet payload data structure includes a language identifier (*fig. 4, 427, 437, paragraph 0050).* Furthermore Bradfield et al. also disclosed the data structure field describing the company or vendor identifier and the network service product name (*fig. 4, 431, 429, paragraph 0050).*.

It would have been obvious to modify the method of Sullivan et al. by adding Bradfield et al. packet payload data structure. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to make the modification because it would include a variety of additional information that can be used to inspect and parse the contents of a received packet (*paragraph 0019).*

In regard to claim 24, Sullivan et al. teach the computer storage medium of claim 20 wherein the string includes one or more of a vendor name (*Microsoft office site, fig. 12)*, a product name (*Wwint, fig. 12)*, an image of the application state (*diagnostic state of the computer into the support center, col. 12 lines 39-50)*, the error message identifier (*having problem with Word, fig. 12)*, and the string enabling interaction between a user and product support via an application programming interface (*request for live help, fig. 4, 74, col. 12 lines 9-50).*

Sullivan et al. does not teach the computer storage medium of claim 20 wherein the string includes a language appropriate for the application.

Bradfield et al. disclosed the method of the packet payload data structure includes a language identifier (*fig. 4, 427, 437, paragraph 0050)*. Furthermore Bradfield et al. also disclosed the data structure field describing the company or vendor identifier and the network service product name (*fig. 4, 431, 429, paragraph 0050)*.

Refer to claim 5 for motivational statement.

****

7. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. (US 6,615,240) in further view of Brundridge et al. (US 2003/0074607).

In regard to claim 9, Sullivan et al. disclosed an application program interface (API) embodied on one or more computer storage media, comprising:

a first parameter related to a vendor identifier (*Microsoft office site, fig. 12)*;

a second parameter related to a product identifier (*Wwint, fig. 12)*;

a third parameter related to an application capable of experiencing an error condition (*having problem with Word, fig. 12)*; and

a fourth parameter related to a unique error message identifier (*incident, having problem with word, fig. 12)*, the unique error message identifier configured to be passed via the API (*Motive support desktop, fig. 12),* and product support (*GUI, server, fig. 1, 12, 24)* receiving the unique error message identifier to match to information concerning the error condition (*search string when fed into the technical support server's search engine should produce relevant hits for solving the technical problem, col. 9 lines 25-28)*.

Sullivan et al. does not explicitly teach an application program interface receiving and passing the unique error message identifier upon system level detection of an application error condition.

Brundridge et al. teach a dynamic display of personal computer support information where the diagnostic program tests a component or device, the diagnostic program generates diagnostic events for each error it encounters and writes the error string and event code to the error log *(paragraph 0026)* and when the error level returned by the command line program is a non-zero, a program is called to parse the error log to build a dynamic HTML interface for the user *(paragraph 0030).*

It would have been obvious to modify the method of Sullivan et al. by adding Brundridge et al. method of dynamic display of personal computer support information. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to make the modification because it would provide end-user support information such as diagnostics in a form in which displayed information is pertinent, easily used, and provides concise answers to computer problems or failures *(paragraph 0010).*

In regard to claim 10, Sullivan et al. disclosed the API of claim 9 wherein product support parses a string including one or more of the parameters, the parsing including:

determining whether the vendor identifier identifies a supported vendor *(Microsoft office site, fig. 12)*;

determining whether the product identifier identifies a supported product *(Wwint, fig. 12)*;

determining whether a version of the application is supported by product support (*version mismatch of wwint, fig. 12)*;

if the vendor (*selfhelpURL, Main Microsoft Office site, fig. 12)*, product (*wwint, fig. 12)* and version (*check for version, fig. 12)* of the application are supported (*Selfhelpanswer, fig. 12)*, performing a search using the unique error message identifier (*selfhelpsearchstring = STRING wwintl32.dll, fig. 12)*, the search in a database of articles concerning errors to identify a cause for the error condition (*search string when fed into the technical support server's search engine should produce relevant hits for solving the technical problem, col. 9 lines 25-28).*

****

8. Claims 12-14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. (US 6,615,240) in further view of Brundridge et al. (US 2003/0074607) in further view of Bradfield et al. (US 2003/0185368).

In regard to claim 12, Sullivan et al. teach a method for handling reports of an error condition, the method providing:

receiving an error message created by an application in response to an error condition in the application (*self help technique generate an error message when user has tried unsuccessfully to launch an application, col. 7 lines 44-50)*;

performing a search in a database of error information (*search string is fed into the technical support server's search engine, col. 9 lines 25-28)* returning results of the search (*return representative result template page, fig. 8, col. 9 lines* 54-61).

Sullivan does not teach the method for handling reports of an error condition where the string is included in the error message contains an error message identifier and determines a cause for the error condition and a remedy for the error condition to match the error message identifier; and performing a search by one or more identifier.

Brundridge et al. teach the method of dynamic display of personal computer support information by generates diagnostic events for each error it encounters and writes the error string and event code to the error log (*paragraph 0026)* and upon detection of a string compares, the parsing program assembles the appropriate FAQs to be displayed to the end-user to utilize in self-repair of the system (*paragraph 0025).* The error log is parsed for error codes (*paragraph 0030)* where events codes have the ability to record multiple events (*paragraph 0034).*

It would have been obvious to modify the method of Sullivan et al. by adding Brundridge et al. method of dynamic display of personal computer support information. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to make the modification because it would provide end-user support information such as diagnostics in a form in which displayed information is pertinent, easily used, and provides concise answers to computer problems or failures (*paragraph 0010).*

Sullivan et al. and Brundridge et al. does not teach the method of hierarchically parsing a string, the string including one or more of a vendor identifier, a product identifier, an application identifier and a language identifier;

Bradfield et al. teach the method to install a network device by implementing a packet that is parsed to detect a received network service code and a received network service rank and where data packet is a predefined fielded packet where each fielded entry, included within the data packet, is readily parsed *(paragraph 0023)* and where the packet payload data structure includes a variety of information *(paragraph 0050, fig. 4, 420).*

It would have been obvious to modify the method of Sullivan et al. and Brundridge et al. by adding Bradfield et al. packet payload data structure. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to make the modification because it would include a variety of additional information that can be used to inspect and parse the contents of a received packet *(paragraph 0019).*

In regard to claim 13, Sullivan et al. disclosed the method of claim 12 further comprising: if the results of the search are a null condition, returning contact information to enable a user to contact product support for further actions *(execution of diagnostic map produces a self-help URL, col. 9 lines 40-49).*

In regard to claim 14, Sullivan et al. disclosed the method of claim 13 wherein a user is provided with a form, fields in the form capable of being loaded via the error message *(Motive* *assistant, fig. 5-7).*

In regard to claim 16, Sullivan et al. teach a computer storage medium having computer-executable instructions for handling reports of an error condition, the computer-executable instructions performing acts comprising:

receiving an error message created by an application in response to an error condition in the application (*self help technique generate an error message when user has tried unsuccessfully to launch an application, col. 7 lines 44-50)*;

performing a search in a database of error information (*search string is fed into the technical support server's search engine, col. 9 lines 25-28)*

returning results of the search (*return representative result template page, fig. 8, col. 9 lines* 54-61).

Sullivan does not teach the method for handling reports of an error condition where the string is included in the error message contains an error message identifier and determines a cause for the error condition and a remedy for the error condition to match the error message identifier; and performing a search by one or more identifier.

Brundridge et al. teach the method of dynamic display of personal computer support information by generates diagnostic events for each error it encounters and writes the error string and event code to the error log (*paragraph 0026)* and upon detection of a string compares, the parsing program assembles the appropriate FAQs to be displayed to the end-user to utilize in self-repair of the system (*paragraph 0025).* The error log is parsed for error codes (*paragraph 0030)* where events codes have the ability to record multiple events (*paragraph 0034).*

Refer to claim 12 for motivational statement.

Sullivan et al. and Brundridge et al. does not teach the method of hierarchically parsing a string, the string including one or more of a vendor identifier, a product identifier, an application identifier and a language identifier;

Bradfield et al. teach the method to install a network device by implementing a packet that is parsed to detect a received network service code and a received network service rank and where data packet is a predefined fielded packet where each fielded entry, included within the data packet, is readily parsed (*paragraph 0023)* and where the packet payload data structure includes a variety of information (*paragraph 0050, fig. 4, 420).*

Refer to claim 12 for motivational statement.

In regard to claim 17, Sullivan et al. teach the computer storage medium of claim 16 wherein the receiving the error message is via a user activating a link to a universal resource locator shown on an error message box that appears following an error condition (*action content pages is a web based content that has one or more diagnostic maps associated with a page via a URL, col. 8 lines 52-64).*

In regard to claim 18, Sullivan et al. teach the computer storage medium of claim 16 wherein the results of the search are displayed to a user that experienced the error condition (*return representative result template page, fig. 8, col. 9 lines* 54-61).

In regard to claim 19, Sullivan et al. teach the computer storage medium of claim 16 wherein the string is parsed hierarchically, so that the search is not performed unless parameters are verified (*search string, fig. 7, 90).*

****

9. Claims 11 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sullivan et al. (US 6,615,240) in further view of Brundridge et al. (US 2003/0074607) in further view of Carpenter et al. (US 6,260,048).

In regard to claim 11, Sullivan et al. disclosed the API of claim 10 wherein product support parsing if one or more of the vendor (*Microsoft office site, fig. 12)*, product (*Wwint, fig. 12)* or version (*version mismatch of wwint, fig. 12)* identifiers.

Sullivan et al. and Brundridge et al. does not teach the system of claim 10 wherein parsing is terminated when one or more identifier is not identify.

Carpenter et al. teaches a resolution of incident which occur during the use of a product by implementing a knowledge tree wherein when the knowledge trees is not sufficient to solve a problem, a trouble ticket is formed which describes the problem encountered and lodged and forwarded to a technical support system within the vendor environment to solve the problem and updates the diagnostic knowledge trees database to reflect the solution *(col. 2 lines 34-48).*

It would have been obvious to modify the system of Sullivan et al. and Bradfield et al. by adding Carpenter et al. resolution of incident. A person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention would have been motivated to make the modification because it would provides significant repair assistance for faulty programs directly in the client environment, paving the way for self-healing software that depends upon the ability to have problems reported, solved and replaced without the client having to become involved in the problem solving process *(col. 2 lines 57-63).*

In regard to claim 15, Sullivan et al. and Brundridge et al. does not explicitly teach the method of claim 13 wherein a null condition indicates an unpredicted error indicative of a problem in the application.

Carpenter et al. teaches a resolution of incident which occur during the use of a product by implementing a knowledge tree wherein when the knowledge trees is not sufficient to solve a problem, a trouble ticket is formed which describes the problem encountered and lodged and forwarded to a technical support system within the vendor environment to solve the problem and updates the diagnostic knowledge trees database to reflect the solution *(col. 2 lines 34-48).*

Refer to claim 11 for motivational statement.

****

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO 892.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LOAN TRUONG whose telephone number is (571) 272-2572. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 9am-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, SCOTT BADERMAN can be reached on (571) 272-3644. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Loan Truong
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2114

SCOTT BADERMAN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER